DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 412 855 HE 030 646

AUTHOR	Gilderbloom, John I.
TITLE	The Urban University in the Community: The Roles of Boards and Presidents. AGB Occasional Paper No. 30.
INSTITUTION	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1996-00-00
NOTE	30p.; Foreword by Hon. Henry G. Cisneros, U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20036 (members, $4.95; nonmembers, $9.95; quantity discounts).
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Board Administrator Relationship; *College Presidents; Governance; *Governing Boards; Higher Education; Institutional Advancement; Institutional Mission; Mission Statements; Policy Formation; Role of Education; *School Community Relationship; *Trustees; Urban Education; *Urban Universities

ABSTRACT

Urban universities and colleges involved in community partnerships need comprehensive information to guide their presidents and boards in successful partnership implementation. Urban institutions should include an urban mission element in their overall mission statements and this should clearly define the goals of institutional leaders. The president's role in successful partnerships is proving requisite leadership and vision to the community, its leaders, and its members and to the university community. The president is also responsible for establishing and maintaining trust between the partners and using the university as a neutral ground. The primary role of the governing board is to balance the needs of the community and the institution. Boards also need to address policy issues such as setting priorities, determining opportunities for collaboration, defining student participation, determining faculty rewards, and establishing criteria for evaluation of success. Other issues boards need to consider include assessment of the general nature of the urban environment of the camps, the costs of developing and maintaining partnerships, and previous local partnership experiences. While there are barriers to successful university-community partnerships, these can be overcome if the partnership is carefully and constantly nurtured. (Contains 15 references.) (JLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 412 855

Association of Governing Boards
of Universities and Colleges

The Urban University in the Community: The Roles of Boards and Presidents

By John I. Gilderbloom

AGB OCCASIONAL PAPER No. 30

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AGB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

HE 030 646

The AGB Occasional Paper Series addresses current and emerging issues of concern to board members and administrators in the context of their institutional settings. Some titles in the series are commissioned by AGB; others are the work of reputable individuals or groups whose work comes to our attention. This series of publications is intended to inform debate and discussion, not to represent or imply endorsement by the association or its members.

AGB distributes complimentary copies of new titles in the Occasional Paper Series to chief executives and board chairs of member institutions. Individuals may purchase additional copies at a nominal charge by calling or writing to AGB. The association grants permission to its members to photocopy and distribute this paper. Copyright © 1996 Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. All rights reserved.

Association of Governing Boards
of Universities and Colleges
One Dupont Circle • Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: 202/296-8400 Fax: 202/223-7053

Foreword

By Hon. Henry G. Cisneros
U.S. Secretary of Housing and Urban Development

Our colleges and universities always have been a source of hope for our nation's future. As repositories and conservators of knowledge, they pass on the accumulated understanding and wisdom of one generation to the next. As centers of thought and research, they continually build on the work of previous generations, constantly expanding our horizons of understanding.

Our institutions of higher learning introduce our young people to the wider world beyond the familiar confines of home and family—to new ideas, new ways of looking at things, and—most important—to other people from widely varying backgrounds and to the rich diversity of human experience. They instill values critical to the health of a democratic society: lifelong respect for learning and openness to new ideas, concern for others beyond our immediate circle of family and friends, personal civic responsibility, and tolerance.

Colleges and universities are an invaluable resource for urban policy and planning. They conduct fundamental research, provide seminal analyses of urban problems, develop strategies for their solution, and support programs to train urban planners and scholars. Academic research has already made vital contributions to the understanding of urban issues, and, through that understanding, to the well-being of American cities. But as important as they are, research and understanding are not enough. Articles, books, and conferences are not enough either. And political capital is not much use, unless it's spent on leadership. By the same token, the value of intellectual capital is diminished if it's not invested in action.

This AGB Occasional Paper by John Gilderbloom is about translating our understanding of the tough urban issues facing us today—homelessness, crime, drugs, housing, jobs, community revitalization—into action. And it's about partnerships for action—between the public and the private sectors, between profit-making businesses and nonprofit organizations, between community-based groups and public agencies, and—especially—between the university and the community. Forging these partnerships is absolutely critical to the future of urban America.

The nation's cities are an important focus of American life. As major centers for commercial activity, cities house the leading banks, communications networks, and international trading companies. They are home to the basic infrastructure of trade and commerce—our roads, bridges, seaports, and airports. The central cities are mega-centers for the arts, education, and scientific discovery. All of these amenities bring together people of diverse races, backgrounds, and religious persuasions.

Many American cities, however, are in steep and steady decline, for reasons both contemporary and historic. Current economic pressures on cities arise from global competition and technological innovation, which are fundamentally restructuring the U.S. economy. Having suffered through more than 20 years of job losses and fiscal stress, our cities can no longer generate robust economic opportunities and create good jobs for those with less than a college education. Businesses have fled to the suburbs or overseas, leaving behind "brownfields"—empty buildings on contaminated lots that no one wants to develop. These communities cannot sustain themselves. Sadly, this fundamental fact of life will not change with an upswing in the business cycle.

The American city, historically the gateway to social and economic mobility, is becoming home to many of the most disadvantaged people in America. Labor force detachment, lack of education, welfare dependency, drug abuse, teenage pregnancy, high infant mortality, and an increase in violent crime reflect a cityscape in which upward mobility and economic independence are virtually unknown. We are in danger of becoming two nations: one with highly skilled, well-paid workers and professionals; the other with a low-skilled, low-wage or even no-wage, permanent underclass.

The resources of our nation's colleges and universities are vital to the fight to save our cities. Institutions of higher learning must join the effort to turn around their communities, not just for moral reasons but also out of enlightened self-interest. The long-term futures of both the city and the university in this country are so intertwined that one cannot, or perhaps will not, survive without the other.

At HUD, we have created the Office of University Partnerships to help universities realize and accomplish their urban mission. The goals of the office are to recognize, reward, and build upon successful examples of universities' activities in local revitalization projects; create the next generation of urban scholars and encourage them to focus their work on housing and community development policy and applied research; and create partnerships with other federal agencies. Now more than ever, universities are essential to helping the department achieve its mission of creating communities of opportunity.

The American institution of higher learning may, in the final years of this century, be entering one of its most challenging and productive eras. Among its tasks will be to help reshape the city to become once again the driving force in the economic, social, and cultural life of this nation. HUD stands ready to make that task more feasible and more likely to succeed. We invite American colleges and universities to join in this worthwhile effort.

But it is not Washington's role to pay for everything, regulate everything, mandate everything. Our role is to marshal resources from all sectors of society and bring them to bear on the problems we face as a society. Our role is to catalyze, facilitate, mediate—and get out of the way and let people of goodwill and good faith in communities do their jobs. Our role is to build a system of support for their efforts. Our role is to promote self-sustaining partnerships for community improvement.

All of us have to take responsibility for the problems facing our nation today. All of us must contribute our time, talents, and resources to resolving them. We all own these problems; we all have a stake in their solution. And, believe me, the only way we can ever solve them is together. They must be solved in communities, by communities, and through community partnerships. That is why this theme of partnership—pooling skills, talents, and resources with other federal agencies and state and local governments, with private industry, with community groups, and, yes, with college and universities—runs like a strong, steady current through everything we're doing at HUD.

In the end, there are no words that can adequately describe how important your work as a chancellor, president, provost, dean, or trustee is to this administration and the future of this country. You have the power to make the university more responsive to the immediate needs of the community. I can only say: Keep it up.

Executive Summary

Urban universities and colleges increasingly are involved in community partnerships to address the problems of their neighboring cities for many reasons, not least of which is a sense of stewardship on the part of the institutions toward their neighborhoods. The partnerships cover a broad range of activities aimed at an equally broad range of problems: crime, drug abuse, neighborhood revitalization, access to quality education, chief among them.

Despite this plethora of university-community partnerships, there is a considerable lack of consistent, comprehensive information on implementing and managing a successful partnership. University presidents and governing boards need guidance as to what works and how to achieve it. They need to understand their roles, relationships, and responsibilities for ensuring the success of a university-community partnership.

The most basic step for institutions to take to ensure the success of a community partnership is to include an urban mission in their overall mission statement, which should clearly set forth and define what institution leaders wish to achieve. To accomplish their stated goals, institutional leaders should commit the necessary resources.

The president's role in ensuring successful partnerships is to provide requisite leadership and vision to the community, its leaders, and its members as well as to the university, its students, faculty, and governing board. The president also is responsible for building and maintaining trust among the partners. The university can provide the neutral ground that creates the common ground.

The primary role of the governing board is to balance the needs of the community with those of the institution. Unfortunately, many governing board members are uninformed about the realities of urban life, but there are many methods for bringing a board up to speed on community problems, including briefings, retreats, and first-hand exposure. Governing boards also need to address a variety of policy issues related to university-community partnerships. These include setting priorities, identifying strengths, determining opportunities for collaboration, evaluating accomplishments, coordinating an institutionwide strategy, setting a reward structure for faculty, ensuring appropriate representation on the board, and ensuring that students participate safely and appropriately in partnership activities.

There are barriers to conducting a successful university-community partnership program. But if a university acts tactfully and in good faith, and if the partnership is carefully and constantly nurtured, the chances are good for creating a vital and active partnership that is truly responsive to the community and its needs.

Funding for this project was provided by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and the ARCO Foundation.

The Urban University in the Community: The Roles of Boards and Presidents

By John I. Gilderbloom

Inner-city communities have severe problems stemming from crime, homelessness, unemployment, underemployment, illiteracy, drugs, underperforming and unsafe public schools, and a host of other challenges. For many inner-city residents, the American dream of homeownership, opportunity, work, and the "good life" seems impossibly out of reach. The hopelessness born of such a condition often manifests itself in destructive behavior as people without hope become desperate. Several cities, however, acting as laboratories of innovation, have created and implemented successful programs that help revitalize and bring hope to inner-city neighborhoods.

Colleges and universities are increasingly important partners in these urban revitalization programs. While much good can come of these university-community partnerships, results to date generally have been inconsistent and marked by distrust or disinterest. While universities are seeking a role, they are unsure of what communities need or want. Moreover, despite a broad range of university-community involvement programs, there has been little agreement on who should be involved to ensure success, what their roles and responsibilities should be, and what the impact on the community could and should be.

In May 1995, the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) hosted a roundtable discussion addressing these concerns. (For more information about the roundtable, see page 26.) This paper summarizes the discussion.

As many of the nation's inner cities continue to decline, taxpayers are becoming increasingly frustrated by the lack of results produced by money spent on urban problems. The realities of scarce resources and increasing social problems are becoming more apparent. The challenge facing the nation has become how to balance the competing demands of fostering an equitable society while running an efficient government.

Academics and community leaders alike are asking if the university can and should be a player in solving our most pressing urban problems. All too often, urban colleges and universities have grown and prospered by virtue of their academic reputation while their surrounding communities have suffered decline. It is as if the university and the city have been on separate tracks, their futures independent of one another. As the late Ernest Boyer documented, the university has too frequently turned inward, focusing on research that has little use for the urban community at large.

Universities must now reverse their historically insular behavior by looking outward and developing a comprehensive strategy to address urban conditions. They must develop policies and practices in line with the mandate set by HUD Secretary Henry G. Cisneros in 1995:

> Our nation's institutions of higher education are crucial to the fight to save our cities. Colleges and universities must join the effort to rebuild their communities, not just for moral reasons but also out of enlightened self-interest. The long-term futures of both the city and the university in this country are so intertwined that one cannot—or perhaps will not—survive without the other. Universities cannot afford to become islands of affluence, self-importance, and horticultural beauty in seas of squalor, violence, and despair (p. 6).

More attention should be placed on teaching partnership strategies, faculty teamwork, and community service. Students should have the opportunity for hands-on community service before they enter the job market. Young scholars should be encouraged to celebrate cultural diversity. When these types of actions are taken, universities can play important roles in partnership with the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. As James J. Stukel, president of the University of

Illinois System and former chancellor of the University of Illinois at Chicago, writes:

> The ideal of the urban university rolling up its sleeves and getting involved in urban affairs will spread because it is a tremendous opportunity to deal with real issues—crime, taxes, the economy, and elementary and secondary education—the issues that are on people's minds every day of the year. This will generate public and political support, which will be increasingly necessary in this era of diminishing resources. And it will actually be doing some good for this country (Stukel 1994, p. 21).

This is not to suggest that universities can, like superheroes, descend into disastrous circumstances and provide instant solutions. Rather, the coupling of fiscal austerity and increasing social challenges demands the creation of new paradigms. And a new paradigm of university involvement will hinge on the university's ability to ask how it can most effectively marshal its rich human resources and move from the ivory tower to confront the harsh realities of the streets. From these questions appropriate and responsible actions can follow.

Historical Precedents

University involvement in addressing public issues is not a new idea. In the 1900s, Catholic and Jesuit schools played a role in serving the needs of the urban poor. Thirty years ago, President Lyndon B. Johnson presented his vision of university-community partnerships in a speech at the opening of the University of California, Irvine. Recognizing that the 20th century was witness to the transformation of the nation from a rural to an urban society, Johnson argued that universities should try to provide answers to the pressing problems of the cities: "just as our colleges and universities changed the future of our farms a century ago.... Why not [create] an urban extension service, operated by universities across the country and similar to the Agricultural Extension Service that assists rural areas?" (Klotsche 1966, p. 51). Six months later, Johnson urged Congress and universities to replicate their success in helping farmers by addressing the needs of the city. Klotsche describes the vision underlying this initiative:

> The role of the university must extend beyond the ordinary extension-type operation. Its research findings and talents must be made available to the community. Faculty must be called upon for consulting activities. Pilot projects, seminars, conferences, TV programs, and task forces drawing on many departments of the university should be brought into play (Klotsche 1966, p. 60).

Similarly, in 1968, noted educational leader Clark Kerr, in an address to the New York City chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, asked those assembled:

> Cannot the intellectual resources that created the new age of science now tackle the equally explosive problem of our cities? The threat is as real and the obligation surely as great. The university can come increasingly to aid the renovation of our cities, and in return the university can be inspired by the opportunities and strengthened by the participation (Kerr 1968, p. 14).

The ensuing period saw the development of many creative, bold, and innovative university-community partnerships. These efforts, however, had mixed results. Cities continued to be overwhelmed by a wide range of social, political, and economic forces—many of which remain to this day, almost 25 years later.

The Importance of a Comprehensive Urban Mission

As much of the literature on poverty indicates (Gilderbloom and Appelbaum 1988), urban issues are complex and interdependent. Because of this, initiatives that are not comprehensive in scope do little more than provide temporary relief. Recent federal programs support such comprehensive initiatives. These programs recommit the federal government as a central player in facilitating urban-university partnerships; they include HUD's Community Outreach Partnership Centers and Joint Community Development Program and the U.S. Department of Education's Urban Community Service Grant Program. Even though the future funding of these federal pro-

grams is uncertain, they have the potential to create sustainable relationships at the local level and be more than just another Band-Aid placed on social problems.

With or without federal support and involvement, evidence suggests that increasing numbers of urban colleges and universities are willing to reexamine their missions and societal roles. Many are actively revitalizing relationships with their communities. Others are sharing ideas and models through such conferences and organizations as the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities. And others, who may not reside in an urban area but carry a statewide mission, are rethinking their responsibilities to major cities of the state.

Institutions with comprehensive urban missions focus a significant portion of their teaching, research, and service efforts on the problems of their host cities. Many of these efforts include faculty research and the provision of technical expertise; some provide direct faculty and student service to the community. As Donald C. Swain, then president of the University of Louisville, said in his Spring 1995 farewell address to the university community, a comprehensive urban mission might consist of partnerships for attacking unemployment and housing shortages in low-income neighborhoods, and for economic development and technical assistance to small and minority-owned businesses. It might include relationships with local health care providers to improve the health care of the elderly and underprivileged; and with the local school system to improve the curriculum, supplement in-service training of teachers and school administrators, and provide mentoring by tenured faculty in specific academic disciplines.

A comprehensive urban mission will have an ongoing student community service and internship effort; programs for working with at-risk youth on issues of job training, self-esteem, drug-abuse prevention, summer recreation and employment, and tutoring; and programs for working with city government and community leaders in low-income areas on neighborhood revitalization.

The mission also may include the education of urban students. Admitting and graduating large numbers of inner-city students—many of them nontraditional, part-time, or adults who are not able to relocate to find better jobs—is critical. Recognizing the obligation to prepare new generations of urban leaders to become teachers, officeholders, and organization heads, as well as to fill all kinds of other roles in the city, is part of the educational mission of an urban college or university.

A comprehensive urban mission might consist of partnerships for attacking unemployment and housing shortages in low-income neighborhoods, and for economic development and technical assistance to small and minority-owned businesses.

The mission also may include the role of "corporate partner." This may mean the university is the community's largest employer, is a developer of city improvement projects, is a planner of research parks to spur economic development with local manufacturing and high-tech industries, or works with not-for-profit or for-profit companies to ensure viable university health clinics and teaching hospitals. Finally, the mission may entail service to city government agencies for economic planning and research, analysis of crime statistics, evaluation of city services, or similar activities.

Before a university or college can embark on a new or enhanced initiative of university-community partnership, and before such partnerships can be fully realized, a number of major policy issues need to be debated by governing boards. Should the institutional mission be examined? What are the costs associated with community partnerships? How can the external urban environment be assessed? These and other policy issues are explored in this paper.

The Importance of Community Partnerships

Writing recently of university-community partnerships, Charles Ruch, president of Boise State University in Idaho, notes that "the interaction should be mutually reinforcing, guided by institutional choice and strategy on the part of both parties, and viewed to be one of value and importance" (Ruch and Trani 1995). While this notion seems simple enough, it is complicated by the fact that each party typically has different customers, agendas, timelines, and motivations. Even within the confines of the university, the roles of the president, the board, and administrative and academic officers must be coordinated to produce a viable and realistic partnership between the urban university and the community in which it resides.

Furthermore, discussions of university-community partnerships frequently fail to recognize distinctions among the many different types of postsecondary institutions. Large multicampus universities, junior colleges, private colleges, and research institutions all have different missions and ways of operating. When viewed as separate entities, the types of partnerships that are feasible and desirable under each type of structural arrangement can be addressed. Similarly, it is important to realize that relationships between universities and the communities in which they are located vary considerably from one place to another. Each community has its own specific set of needs and unique history and culture. In addition, universities have different amounts and kinds of resources and capacities. Without a clear vision that takes all of these factors into account, an urban mission will be fraught with ambiguity, and partnerships specifically tailored for a given community cannot be developed.

Each college and university first must address the nature of its own urban environment and determine how that environment relates to the campus. In so doing, it should not view cities as totally impaired or dysfunctional entities. Even with their multitude of problems, urban areas are still vibrant communities. They have much to offer as economic and cultural centers, and universities can benefit from their resources in very practical ways. As Wim Wiewel of the University of Illinois at Chicago writes in personal correspondence:

> If it is only from a sense of noblesse oblige that colleges and universities commence an urban agenda, their efforts will be viewed by their cities as condescending and fall short. Communities, even poor ones, are places of ethnic pride and heritage, of culture and art, of safety and acculturation, of creativity and vitality of political strength and resistance. If communities are only viewed as places of problems, what can they offer the university? In fact, problem definition, identification of solutions, implementation and evaluation all have to be done jointly because there is knowledge in the community that is different from, but complementary to, the knowledge that universities have.

Recognition that the relationship is indeed a two-way street provides further rationale for the establishment of partnerships. One of the AGB roundtable participants, Michael Garanzini, vice president for academic affairs of St. Louis University, pointed out that the university is a permanent part of the city: Its fate is tied to the fate of the city, and it does not have the option of leaving as a business or corporation might. Ruch and Trani note in *Metropolitan Universities: An Emerging Model in American Higher Education* (1995) that "metropolitan universities are not simply in the city but of the city, and the importance of activities with their surrounding environment is central to the life of the institution."

Some universities have been forced into community partnerships purely out of a need for survival. A university can be devastated by racial unrest, rioting, high crime, or a shocking murder in their surrounding community. These problems create the necessity for partnerships to help a community with innovative, responsive, and pragmatic programs. Without these vital partnerships, the fate of both the university and the community would be in peril.

The issue of institutional survival also depends in part on where students come from and where they go after graduation. Urban universities that attract mostly local students who remain in the community may be more motivated by practical reasons to forge partnerships than universities without a largely local student body. In tight-knit communities, it may be possible to cre-

ate a symbiotic relationship between university and community.

Institutional Leadership: The Roles of Presidents and Governing Boards

College and university presidents and their governing boards must be agents of change, establishing and implementing policies that enable institutions to develop and strengthen university-community partnerships. They must provide the resources and incentives to move in the desired direction if an urban mission is to be more than rhetoric.

The President

A president has the largest role in a college or university in seeing that existing partnerships are continued, new ones are initiated, and success is rewarded. The role of the president is perhaps best addressed in the context of vision and leadership. Presidents set the direction in which their universities will change and grow. They do this through both their verbal messages and actions. As chief spokesperson for the institution, what a president says commands a great deal of attention. Speeches that are not backed up by commitment and substantive action—even when they are well-intentioned—will make creating inroads into the community more difficult in the future. Unfulfilled promises undermine the element of trust that must be present if partnerships are to achieve their maximum potential. The transition from rhetoric to action, however, can be a difficult course to negotiate.

Fear of controversy may make some university presidents more reluctant to enter into new relationships and to assume new roles for themselves and the university. Presidents have many internal and external constituencies, and the risks associated with taking action on an issue—be the action substantive or symbolic—can disrupt a base of support, and thus result in a reluctance to act. Addressing a major social problem in the community carries the risk of being unsuccessful and the added risk of damaged relations with the community. And even if an initiative *is* successful, community groups and city leaders may feel their domain has been invaded. Universities also may have to contend with the criticism of community groups that were not brought into partnership roles.

Despite these constraints, university presidents must persuade others—and be themselves convinced—that partnership efforts can strengthen their institutions. For example, the late Daniel H. Perlman, president of Suffolk University until 1989, suggested a range of symbolic and substantive functions that university presidents can undertake to help build solid relations with a predominately minority community:

> By inviting the leaders of the various ethnic and racial minority communities to visit the campus and speak to student groups, by encouraging the parents and families of current and prospective minority students to visit the campus and share in the celebration of special holidays and festivals, by meeting with minority business groups and hiring their members, by becoming personally visible in the minority communities, and by showing that cultural diversity is not only tolerated but actively encouraged and cherished, presidents of metropolitan universities can promote a climate that will enhance the effectiveness of their institutions both in their function as neighbor, employer, and consumer (Johnson and Bell 1995, p. 208).

Presidents at successful urban institutions have built ongoing, trusting relationships with city government, community, and business leaders. They meet frequently to discuss issues of mutual concern, such as community health care, crime, job training, and so forth. If such a forum did not exist when they arrived at the institution, they took steps to initiate informal meetings with these leaders. As part of these discussions, the role of the university as a service provider and resource to the community is explored.

Within the institution, the president must first assess the institutional mission to determine if it clearly articulates the institution's desire to create urban partnerships. If it falls short or requires expansion, the president must work with the board to see that it is revised. As the chief officer of the university, the president must next persuade and encourage deans, department chairs, and faculty to be responsive to community concerns. This may entail a change in the faculty-reward structure; it also entails the en-

couragement of interdepartmental initiatives—a bringing together of combinations of departments that might not otherwise communicate or cooperate with one another. This work is particularly important in dealing with multifaceted urban issues that cut across a wide spectrum of disciplines. Affordable housing can and should involve, for example, law, sociology, social work, architecture, and planning.

Regardless of the level of formal partnerships, faculty at urban-based institutions will have a number of points of contact and natural relationships with various elements of the community in such disciplines as education, business, social work, and community health. Just as the board must support the president in his or her efforts to build partnerships with the community, the president (and other senior academic administrators) must show support for these faculty members by meeting with them periodically to understand the issues they face and the relationships they have developed through their research and public service, and by working on meaningful expansion or replication of their efforts.

If the institution's mission does not clearly articulate a desire to create urban partnerships, the president must work with the board to revise or expand the mission.

A president must determine the budget implications of new or potential partnerships, whether external funding should be pursued, and—if not—whether the need is so compelling that a request for a reallocation of existing dollars should be made of the governing board. Presidents of public urban institutions must advocate the funding needs of their institutions not only to the governing board but also to the governor, legislature, and other state boards and officials.

Effective leadership will result if the president and governing board can work cooperatively with each other. It is critical that presidents bring before the board the policy options related to the institution's partnership program and that the board support the president in the realization of the program once a policy is established. When boards are clear about the meaning of an urban mission, the president will be better able to take meaningful action.

The Governing Board

If university-community partnerships are to last and succeed, governing boards must play an enhanced role. Governing boards shoulder the immense responsibility of shaping institutions and their values. They must do this while maintaining fiscal discipline, raising funds, and fostering institutional growth and creativity. These various tasks serve to position boards between the demands of the public, their founders, elected leaders, or other institutional stakeholders and the needs and desires of university administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

Boards must play pivotal roles in pushing the administration to articulate and pursue an urban mission. However, some people assert trustees and regents may be insulated from the very issues that serve as the impetus for the creation of collaborative partnerships. This concern may be particularly true for large multicampus system boards (and less true for community college boards) that may not focus on the issues confronting their urban campuses. It also may apply to institutions whose board members typically reside far from the city or outside the state and who come to campus only for board meetings. Such institutions are missing valuable opportunities. As Joseph Harris of the National Center for Urban Partnerships said at the roundtable:

> There's a gap in the knowledge base of trustees—and very often [of] presidents—in terms of what is their role, what is their responsibility, when it comes to responding to their environment.

Policy Issues for Governing Boards

In addition to a positive working relationship with the president, boards of trustees must be informed and aware of the policy issues involved in urban partnerships before they can develop a clear sense of how to proceed. What are the issues boards and presidents together must consider? What questions should boards ask?

Mission Statements

Surprisingly, only 12 percent of the urban universities have a mission statement that addresses urban needs (AASCU 1995). If fundamental change in the way universities relate to their communities is to occur, an appropriate place to begin is with institutional mission statements. With a mission statement that clearly articulates the institutional commitment to its host city, a college or university can begin to play a significant role in helping its community understand and combat urban problems. During a period of constrained resources and insistent demands for educational quality, many trustees may ask whether it is wise to expand the institutional mission to include the community, or if it is better to concentrate on liberal arts education, teacher education, graduate education, or whatever the institution does—or should be doing—best.

Without question, institutions must be true to their primary mission. An urban mission can be an outgrowth of an institution's primary mission, but it can never drive it. Boards also must ensure that institutional ideals are not compromised—the education of their students and the collection, dissemination, and advancement of knowledge.

Whether its mission or reputation is regional, national, or international, an institution cannot allow assistance to its host city to drain resources or divide the university's attention. By planning strategically, boards can develop a commitment to the city without jeopardizing their institution's ideals, primary mission, or reputation. The following examples of board-approved urban mission statements from the University of Louisville and the University of Houston System demonstrate such commitments.

The University of Louisville. "The University of Louisville shall serve as Kentucky's urban/metropolitan university. Located in the commonwealth's largest metropolitan area, it shall serve the specific educational, intellectual, cultural, service, and research needs of a diverse population, including many ethnic minorities and place-bound, part-time, non-traditional students. U of L shall be a research university that places special emphasis on the research and service needs of Kentucky's urban areas. Research shall be encouraged, in particular, as part of doctoral and high-priority programs. Through its research and service efforts, it shall contribute to economic development, educational reform, and problem-solving initiatives in the commonwealth."

The University of Houston System. "The future of our state and nation depends as never before on the integrity of our cities—on their ability to forge a productive and integrated society, to provide an acceptable quality of life and standard of living, and to compete in global markets. As a consequence, a new imperative emerges for higher education, and the urban university takes on an unprecedented role in meeting the challenges of the future.

"The four universities of the University of Houston System are driven by this imperative. We attribute much of our structure and character to the people, institutions, and energy of urban life. We define ourselves not in isolated 'academic' terms but in terms of the social and economic complexity of the city, and we are committed to developing and sharing our intellectual resources with the communities from which we draw our strength and purpose. This does not mean that we in any way jeopardize the core values and freedoms of the academy or compromise exacting standards of excellence. We steadfastly refuse to reduce the pursuits of intellect to mere utility or the academy to a service organization whose agenda is set by others. Instead, our task is to reawaken public consciousness in order to focus on pressing problems and challenges that we cannot solve alone but—equally true—cannot be solved without us."

Other Policy Issues

While clarification of the mission is a critical beginning, many other policy issues also require board consideration.

• How do we assess the general nature of the urban environment around the

campus? An occasional, perhaps yearly, board meeting in the community with community leaders as guests can give the board a better feel for the environment around the campus. If a number of students are from the community, the board could invite them to speak at a board meeting. Many faculty members probably have a community relationship for certain activities; they also should be heard by the board.

In addition, the chairman of the board or other appropriate board members could join with the president at some of his or her regular meetings with city government, community, and business leaders. These board members, along with the president, can play a useful role in communicating the discussions heard at these meetings to the full board.

Board retreats are also valuable in terms of educating trustees and regents and creating a shared sense of vision. As William Maxwell, former president of Jersey City State College, suggested at the AGB roundtable, a reading list compiled by the president may be a helpful in orienting board members and providing a platform for growth. While retreats and literature can assist board members in becoming familiar with urban issues and the role of the university, they are no substitute for physically entering the community and gaining first-hand exposure to it.

While retreats and literature can assist board members in becoming familiar with urban issues and the role of the university, they are no substitute for physically entering the community and gaining firsthand exposure to it.

• What are the costs of developing partnerships? Are partnerships sustainable in the long run after initial funding or commitment declines? The board is responsible for ensuring adequate resources to carry out the institutional mission, including aspects that apply to community partnership programs. Revising or expanding the mission will be meaningless unless dollars are placed behind it. The board and the president must determine which partnerships must be initiated, which sustained, and which terminated. Government and private support can underwrite the university's involvement with the city, but such funding never is guaranteed. Various departments or faculty members involved in partnerships may vie for the board's attention, and the board may need to develop priorities to help determine which program deserves greater funding. For example, board priorities may reward those programs serving the city's neediest, those serving the surrounding neighborhood, or those where the institution may have the largest impact. Long-term commitments to the idea of partnerships also may require a reallocation of internal funds as external funding ends. Although it may be very difficult for the board to do, a budget reallocation is always an option.

• What have we learned from past experience in working with our city? Many universities engaged in successful partnerships have realized that no single institution can turn around the inner city by itself. Other entities must be equal partners with the university in this effort. In some instances, this may require the resources and coordination of others, forcing the university to limit its role to that of a facilitator or broker. This realization is perhaps a change from the idealism of the 1960s and 1970s, when many felt universities could practically single-handedly solve urban problems with the aid of targeted federal money.

University leaders also may find that some entities, rather than collaborate, play political games because of power, status, money, or other concerns and that it may be difficult to build bridges to particular groups. Universities must bring an honest and objective viewpoint to the table, and, in so doing, become an effective interface between community and government.

It is critical for boards and presidents to learn from the experiences of other institutions in

other cities. The most pressing problems of the inner city may appear overwhelming, the odds for meaningful change too remote, or the environment too unsafe to risk university money or personnel. Institutions seeking to engage in an urban mission may want to start in incremental ways and build a more comprehensive program later. They may wish to focus on one segment of the population—say inner-city youth—or they may wish to work with locally owned businesses, perhaps creating a "business incubator" that provides financing or consulting and technical assistance for economic development.

An issue for many research-oriented institutions is to find a way to link community needs with research agendas. The downside of such research is that community leaders sometimes have viewed such research with skepticism—as research *on* the community rather than research *for* the community. University personnel must bear in mind that they are not dealing with experimental subjects that can be controlled, tested, studied, and then later written about in a scientific journal. Rather, they must offer their expertise in diagnosing a particular problem and suggesting a range of solutions.

• **With whom should the institution collaborate?** Collaboration will depend on what activities are pursued and where a board feels its institution can make a difference. Boards should expect the administration to develop a plan that includes neighborhood groups (including organizations that represent the racial and ethnic diversity of the city), city government, the school system, local businesses and corporations, and possibly labor unions and not-for-profit organizations. Urban land-grant institutions also may seek to collaborate with the cooperative extension service. Joining or forming a consortium with other universities in the metropolitan area may be desirable.

• **Does the institution have political strengths and contacts that can help it create effective partnerships?** It is in tackling this question that individual board members may be helpful to the full board, using their contacts with city, state, and federal government leaders either for resources or to cut through red tape. Trustees who are members of the community can serve as individual bridges to that community, perhaps through service on other community boards or through business links with the community.

• **In what partnerships are we now engaged? Are they all they could be?** The board must have a full understanding of its institution's academic departments and be aware of the activities in which it is currently engaged. To gain an understanding of the potential of partnerships, boards may want to seek information on departments with natural links to the community (through social work, education, and urban studies, for example) or other programs with required student internship and practicum experience. Not to be overlooked are professional schools such as business, law, and medicine which may be servicing hundreds of poor clients every year.

An institution developing a comprehensive urban mission—or at least a mission active on many fronts—attempts to bring visibility and support to these current activities and sees what can be learned from them. It also tries to see what universitywide partnerships can be initiated. As former Harvard University President Derek Bok (1996) notes, "The problem is that the whole often fails to equal the sum of its parts. Because no one knows what others are doing, important opportunities for collaboration and synergy are lost."

• **How can a coordinated institutionwide strategy be developed?** The decision of where to locate partnerships within the university is more than just a question of logistics. Placement of an office can sometimes reflect stature—for example, an office located within the president's office may connote that a particular function is of special importance to the administration. Placement of an office also has important implications for direction and control of the partnership.

The board, together with the president, is responsible for determining the priority given to the partnership initiative by approving and funding the partnership office. Some would argue that since the university is opening itself up for increased scrutiny when it enters into new relationships with the community, the partnership should be coordinated out of the offices of the president or senior administration. Others would argue that one who is actually on the "front line"

(such as a faculty member) should direct the activities of the office. In any case, faculty expertise should be at the fingertips of the person staffing a coordinated strategy.

• Where are our students and faculty in terms of commitment to the community? What is the reward structure for faculty? Zelda Gamson (1995) of the University of Massachusetts at Boston, writing on the issue of community responsibilities of faculty, remarks, "For years, academic leaders...have argued that higher education has to become more engaged with societal issues. Student service barely scratches the surface. We need the expertise and involvement of our faculties if we are to make a difference." Changing faculty contracts to delineate community service as a requirement and a basis for evaluation may be a means to achieve the goal of increased faculty participation in community partnerships. The reward and incentive structure is critical within institutions with an urban mission. This important issue, as well as student community service, is addressed later in this paper.

• Can the membership or structure of the board better reflect the needs of the institution? It is a challenge for board members who reside out of state or outside the city to develop a full sense of the urban environment in which their institution is located beyond quick impressions and anecdotes. At one extreme are boards of prestigious independent institutions whose members find it understandably difficult to devote time and effort to potential or existing university partnership opportunities. In these cases, it is incumbent upon the university's president and senior administration to educate the board and for board members themselves to commit time to staying in the city an extra day or afternoon to learn of institutional initiatives or community needs. Such boards may be served best by appointing a board subcommittee or task force—with members drawn from faculty, staff, and community leadership as well as from the board itself—to address the issues at hand. The board also may want to consider appointing one or two local community leaders as regular members of the board.

On the other extreme are boards that may be composed totally of members from the community. A community college president once warned that such a board must not become a "Trojan Horse" for the desires of the community—that is, it must not see itself as a vehicle to carry all of the needs and concerns of the community to be suddenly unleashed on the president in the public forum of a board meeting. Even if chosen in a popular election, board members must understand that their duty is to balance equally the needs of the community with those of the institution.

The membership of most boards will fall in between these two extremes, with a balance of local membership and statewide or national membership. Public boards appointed by the governor should appeal for an appropriate balance of community and state leaders.

• How will the board measure success? Evaluation should not be an afterthought. Each partnership program should have goals and objectives that attempt to improve the quality of life for the community the program is designed to serve. The board should expect data that documents the results of such programs so it can determine which programs to continue to fund. Progress within programs that address major social issues will be incremental at best. Also, the definition of success is more complicated in the field than in the laboratory. The definition of success often might depend more on the eye of the beholder than on any specific objective measure. One university reported, for example, in working with underachieving youth, that test scores were raised considerably but not enough to be considered "passing." Is this a success or a failure?

Politics also may affect evaluation. A change in city administration may have an influence over what types of information an agency is willing to collect and turn over to university evaluators. Tangential benefits from community-partnership programs also will occur for students and faculty involved in community service; these should be welcomed and acknowledged by the board.

Special Considerations for Public Multicampus Governing Boards

State boards must assess their own track records to see how they encourage or discourage college and university participation in community partnerships. First, there should be an explicit expectation of an urban mission for either

the system or its urban institutions. The University of Houston System statement is truly exemplary. It is from an agreed-upon mission statement and strategic plan that all activities flow.

Multicampus system boards must serve simultaneously as the governing board for the system as well as for each component institution—admittedly a difficult assignment, especially in a system that may have both a long-established, well-regarded flagship university and a newer and less prestigious urban university vying for limited resources. System boards must strive to balance these tensions while seeking consistency in critical policy decisions, such as the distribution of academic programs and the allocation of dollars among institutions. The boards can accomplish this by educating themselves on the issues of their urban campuses so they are in a position to support and advocate urban campus needs adequately. When the board has a meeting on the campus, it should devote some time to understanding the urban environment by visiting the site of a partnership activity. Also, if there is no urban university in the system or if urban areas are unserved, the board should ensure that one of its institution's missions extend (within reason) to major cities of the state.

A multicampus board should consider the creation of a local governing or advisory board for its urban campus or campuses, especially if the system comprises institutions in various parts of the state. Local boards can help focus system board attention on local concerns while serving as a bridge to the community. Because local boards may serve many functions, institutional and system leaders must be careful that such boards never become captive to any local constituency. It is best if local boards are appointed with prescribed authority from the system board.

Multicampus boards (and state coordinating boards as well) should set different and flexible expectations for faculty. Statewide faculty work load studies may not be designed to measure the community-service activities of urban college faculty members adequately, or they may leave an impression on state policy makers that urban college faculty members who engage in many hours of service are not fulfilling traditional teaching or research duties. System boards should ensure that faculty-reward structures at their urban campuses adequately recognize applied research and service to the community. Such guidelines may need to be different from those of other institutions in the system.

Similarly, expectations and performance evaluations of urban college presidents must take into consideration the job's unique requirements.

Urban universities within multicampus systems, or under statewide coordinating agencies with budget allocation authority, must be granted a level of flexibility in their budgeting process. Just as land-grant institutions need resources for outreach to rural communities, resource allocations that differ from preset funding formulas may be needed to establish or maintain incentives for community partnership activities.

Issues Related to Institutional Change

Universities cannot ignore the clamor of businesses that want college graduates retrained to maximize their effectiveness as employees. Nor can they ignore the value of research applied to community problems or the need for graduate students (who will become the faculty members of the future) to be trained in nontraditional ways to encourage creative contemplation of expanded functions of the university. Therefore, the curriculum must include the many lessons that currently are offered through partnership initiatives. Dissertation research in many fields should be directed toward more practical problems. Faculty and staff involved in community service must bring their experiences into the classroom. The traditional "teach and research" paradigm too often gives short shrift to public and community service.

Other issues have been identified concerning the current training of researchers that need to be addressed. Christina Groark and Robert McCall (in press) argue that talent, competence, trust, and respect are essential ingredients of effective collaborations. According to them, however,

> These requirements are often antithetical to the way we train researchers, for example, who typically are taught to work independently, to maintain control over every aspect of the research enterprise, and to achieve within a profession that rewards individual productivity and contribution.

In an interview on university-community partnerships, McCall, codirector of the University of Pittsburgh's Office of Child Development and Policy Evaluation Project, said, "We need to broaden our student audience beyond those enrolled in our classes and our scholarly audience beyond our academic colleagues. Our academic reward structure should encourage applied scholarship and education, broadly defined, on a par with basic, empirical research." Similarly, Ernest Boyer (1992) argues that standards for measuring faculty scholarship must now include the potential application for meeting pressing societal problems.

Creating Incentives for Faculty

One of the biggest obstacles to successful community partnerships is the lack of expectations, rewards, and incentives for faculty. Derek Bok (1996) writes "only if collaboration with the city is seen as part of one's professional development will such work survive and prosper. But even the most committed universities have often found this hard to do." Partnerships, community service, and applied research can be promoted by considering them more often when making tenure, promotion, and faculty contract decisions, and university presidents and governing boards can directly influence this process. To do so, however, requires an understanding of the complexity of the issue.

Partnerships, community service, and applied research should be considered more often when making tenure, promotion, and faculty contract decisions. University presidents and trustees can directly influence this process.

The phrase "publish or perish" is all too familiar to those in and around academic circles. According to a national survey of faculty conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, granting of tenure has become increasingly dependent on publications over the last 25 years. The implications of this criterion for survival make applied research less attractive to researchers: Since applied research is not as "clean" as controlled experimental research, it tends to be devalued by academic journals. In the worst-case scenario, meaningful research is sacrificed in the name of scientific excellence. Recent advances in the fields of research methods and policy evaluation have helped bring social research to more respectable levels in the academic community. Nevertheless, in university settings where tenure and promotion are dependent on publication, applied research is a risky route. Given the demanding and difficult nature of applied research, the most talented researchers should be engaged in it. Unless the reward structure is changed, however, many will be reluctant to spend their time doing applied research in the community.

Institutions also have been slow to develop criteria by which to rate community service. In a recent survey of 186 members of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, more than a quarter of the respondents cited lack of recognition of community service as a scholarly activity as a significant barrier to meeting a metropolitan/urban mission (AASCU 1995).

The issue of the reward system as it applies to public service also is complicated by the fact that some fields lend themselves to community service more readily than do others. Institutions that are primarily research-oriented may fear that changing the reward structure will drive away valuable researchers and weaken the organization's overall level of quality. Where to draw boundaries over what is acceptable public service is not always an easy call to make. Too often, faculty service is defined as internal department or committee work—and not service to the surrounding community. And while student community service and service-learning encouraged and supported by the faculty are important on many levels, the need to engage faculty as more than just facilitators of students—especially those

who teach within communities with dire needs—has never been greater.

Boards and presidents of urban institutions have begun to see how universitywide expectations can be integrated into college and department expectations and the reward structure adjusted accordingly so that applied research and community service become explicit requirements for contract renewal, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. Department reward structures needn't be monolithic; rather, they should recognize the differences among academic fields and even among individual faculty members within disciplines. In such a flexible system, fields that lend themselves to partnerships, public service, and applied research on community problems can be identified, and fields needing more "traditional" reward structures still can attract quality faculty. Robert Diamond (1993) of Syracuse University and his associates have written extensively on the principles and practicalities of flexible faculty-reward systems that urban institutions should examine.

Department reward structures needn't be monolithic; rather, they should recognize the differences among academic fields and even among individual faculty members within disciplines.

Although the biggest incentive for involving faculty in appropriate community partnerships may be through reward structures for tenure and promotion, another way is to offer budgetary incentives. Such incentives can be created—in keeping with institutional and board priorities—within the university by the governing board. For an urban institution, this could be competitive grants within departments or financial rewards for individual faculty. The University of Minnesota, for example, solicits requests for proposals from faculty members to conduct policy research on pressing needs of the Twin Cities area. Selected proposals offer two-months' salary plus a part-time graduate research assistant for the year as support for carrying out the project. Dennis Jones (1995), president of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, has prescribed how governing boards can develop incentives within the budget through a process called "strategic budgeting." The principles and procedures of strategic budgeting are easily adaptable to urban institutions.

Such incentives can help alleviate another barrier to faculty involvement in the community—time constraints. Office hours and teaching-load requirements, especially at liberal arts and comprehensive institutions, detract from the amount of time that can be devoted to off-campus activities. Quality instruction is more often than not dependent on a significant investment of time spent in class preparation. A lack of resources and time to get involved to the extent necessary to solve problems is often a barrier to meeting a metropolitan/urban mission.

The Emergence of Service-Learning and Student Community Service

Campus Compact, COOL (Campus Outreach Opportunity League), the Partnership for Service Learning, and the Corporation for National and Community Service have placed student community service and service-learning on the front burner for many institutions.

Service learning has many benefits for community organizations. Students are working and providing needed assistance to the community in the name of the institution while obtaining the spiritual benefits that come from helping others along the way. Insights often missed by conventional research can be obtained by students working under the guidance of faculty, while the community organization sometimes can obtain a better sense of its strengths and weaknesses from the objective analysis a trained outsider can provide.

The involvement of universities in community partnerships gives students an opportunity to test the theories and techniques that are pre-

sented in their course work. Through community service and service-learning, students can determine how community dynamics work through real-life experience as opposed to through written and verbal descriptions. In the process of field work, students may either find a career that is appealing to them or discover that the career they thought they wanted was much different in real life.

The urban environment can be an effective classroom. Field work offers students valuable lessons they can use later. In a conversation on the Internet, David Moore from the University of New Orleans commented:

> Having given graduate students the opportunity to work in "cancer alley" has opened their eyes to a lot of issues and resulted in a deeper understanding of environmental justice. I have personally witnessed this initial work turn into a passion in one individual who I am sure will have an impact on the movement.

Education tends to become more meaningful to students as they are able to draw from their own experiences and make judgments about the validity of the concepts taught them. Through field work, opportunities increase for students to find solutions to their questions rather than rely solely on the feedback of their instructors. Finally, when students are able to apply their knowledge directly to realistic situations, rather than simply prepare for exams, they are more likely to retain the information gained.

Students are often on the front lines of many of the partnership activities of their institutions. They perform many of the actual activities that partnerships are formed to do: student teaching, helping staff a health clinic, or assisting on a demographic study, for example. Although students are invaluable to successful partnerships, there are three inherent dangers to avoid.

First, students must not just "front" for the institution—that is, perform the bulk of the partnership activity—while faculty and other institutional administrators sit back disengaged from any meaningful level of community involvement.

The second concern involves adequate safety precautions. Institutions must do their best to ensure they are not jeopardizing students' well-being by placing them in unsafe situations.

The third concern, raised by Nevin Brown at the roundtable, regards the nature of students' time commitments at a university. As Brown remarked, "In a long-term collaborative effort, students may come and go. This can take a toll in the development of long-term, personal, collegial relationships that often are critical to the success of the partnership."

Barriers to Successful Partnerships

Several types of barriers affect an institution's urban partnership that need to be continually evaluated and discussed at the policy level by the board and president.

Tensions between various community players can be detrimental to the success of partnership initiatives. For example, when a university is formulating a plan for grant dissemination among community organizations, it must be aware of the political consequences of excluding certain groups from the allocation. Another unfortunate aspect of partnerships involves the other end of the project—when success is achieved, and disagreement erupts over who should get the credit.

Universities cannot force their way into the community; they must be invited. Buy-in costs frequently are associated with working with long-standing community groups, and inconsistent behavior by a university drives up these costs. Charitable acts and temporary "do good" programs are not the foundation of durable relationships or the sign of a comprehensive strategy developed by the president and the governing board. They only serve to open the door.

Many barriers to success are rooted in mistrust of universities. Government institutions at the local, state, and federal levels, as well as quasi-public agencies and not-for-profit organizations, have set patterns for functioning in relation to one another. Some localities resist the entrance of universities into partnership roles for fear of upsetting the balance among existing players. Institutions need to be sensitive not to intrude upon already existing and effective partnerships. If a university has not previously demonstrated a commitment to the city, community groups may mistrust the institution's motives. They may question whether the participation of university

faculty would impede or duplicate work performed by private consultants or other paid employees. In a climate of scarce resources, some community organizations may fear that universities will infringe upon their base of financial support. This fear may be substantiated by the fact that many university-sponsored community initiatives frequently require matching funds from community organizations. Thus, university and community entities may find themselves competing for the same funding sources.

Stereotypes and preconceived notions may hamper effective communication. For example, academics may be viewed as egotistical or out of touch with real-world conditions, and government employees may be victims of "bureaucrat-bashing."

Symbolic partnerships such as blood drives, book collections, and delivering meals to the elderly offer little risk to either partner. If they fall apart, little is lost. It is the substantive partnerships, such as discovering the causes of homelessness or creating jobs or affordable housing, that are high-risk ventures—particularly for the university. Something more precious than money or resources is involved in its failure. The university risks its prestige and preeminent position in the community if the project fails.

One of the greatest strengths many university programs provide might also be the most serious problem hindering these programs: partnership. As related in this paper, partnerships rely on a fragile coalition for continuity and accomplishment. If the coalition falters, then the program may falter as well. The involved parties must provide the partnership with constant nurturing to keep it vital, active, and responsive to the needs of the community and its residents.

Conclusion

Difficult as the current fiscal, social, and political environment is for our cities, it may become more problematic in the future. New fiscal pressures on the cities are a certainty due to constrained local, state, and federal budgets and from potential major restructuring of such federal programs as Aid to Families with Dependent Children and Medicaid and for other programs such as job training. The added fiscal pressures may, in turn, exacerbate current social problems.

Universities cannot physically flee the cities. They are a permanent part of their communities. But being a permanent part of the community carries an obligation to interact with the city and the surrounding neighborhoods. The boards and presidents of urban universities and colleges must lead their institutions into an appropriate level of community involvement, an involvement based on expanded notions of traditional educational missions and purposes that will be sustained through fiscal cycles and political change.

Universities and colleges generally command great public respect. They can bring ideas framed in the context of objective truths and moral persuasion, and they can take risks that others might try to avoid. Governing boards at all urban colleges and universities need to engage in a full discussion of the policy issues involved in developing university-community partnerships to help clarify what may or may not work for their particular institution. These partnerships are risky undertakings that can result in symbolic or substantive gains for the community at large or in failure and controversy. But by developing such partnerships, colleges and universities can turn the ivory tower into a bridge to the community.

Appendix A

Examples of Successful Partnerships at Public and Private Institutions

In working together—often with the federal, state, and private support—several universities and cities have established partnership programs aimed at revitalizing inner-city neighborhoods. The following four examples demonstrate the breadth of partnerships across the nation. There are, of course, many other such partnerships.

• The University of Illinois at Chicago.[1] The purpose of the UIC Neighborhoods Initiative is to assist in community revitalization to benefit current residents, businesses, and other institutions. The initiative brings together university, city, and community resources to address needs in a proactive, integrated, and lasting way. UIC has made a ten-year commitment to the initiative; if the program is successful, this support is expected to be extended indefinitely.

The UIC Neighborhoods Initiative is part of the university's Great Cities program, a major institutional planning and action effort aimed at making UIC a national model for urban land-grant universities. Under the leadership of then UIC Chancellor James J. Stukel in collaboration with the university's board of trustees, the Great Cities program reflects UIC's commitment to meeting urban needs in the metropolitan area. As part of the program, many UIC faculty members already are engaged in intervention, outreach, and research efforts throughout Chicago.

Increasingly, researchers are recognizing the value of comprehensive projects that combine a range of disciplines in simultaneous and coordinated efforts. Addressing only educational problems, for instance, while leaving family, health, and economic needs unmet, is unlikely to have long-lasting positive outcomes. The comprehensive approach requires the development of intensive partnerships, since no institution alone has all of the knowledge or resources needed to be effective.

The UIC Neighborhoods Initiative is based on a partnership model. UIC envisions itself as a member of the community rather than as an outsider. As a community member, the university brings its unique resources together with those of others. The process of defining the application and use of these resources must, of necessity, be a joint and cooperative one. Furthermore, even as the community is expected to change as a result of this process, so too is the university expected to change. Other institutions—such as Chicago's government and public agencies, corporations, and philanthropic and civic organizations—will join the partnership as appropriate for specific projects.

Implementation of the UIC Neighborhoods Initiative builds on efforts already in place and on the active development of new opportunities. The UIC neighborhoods Initiative is overseen by an advisory committee and managed by the Great Cities Office. Members of the advisory committee are equally divided between community and UIC representatives. The initiative consists of the following community outreach partnerships and strategies:

Affordable Housing Consortium. Supports the improvement of existing housing stock and the development of new affordable housing through participatory design and planning and home-improvement grants and loans.

UIC Hiring and Purchasing Community Linkage. Increases access to UIC jobs and contracts for residents and businesses in adjacent neighborhoods.

Commercial and Industrial Area Design. Works to improve the physical attractiveness of local commercial and industrial areas through architecture and design expertise.

Great Cities/Great Careers. Develops new programs in partnership with corporations and local schools to provide training and jobs for local residents and improves the transition of high school students from school to work.

Incubators for Youth Program. Offers opportunities to youth living in Henry Horner Homes, a neighborhood housing project, for exploration in entrepreneurial activities.

Near West Side and Pilsen Joint Community Development Program. Uses HUD funds to create $50 million in commercial and business development. Ensures, with the assistance of UIC faculty and students, high-quality development responsive to community needs.

Parent Leadership. Develops programs focusing on adult literacy and community health.

School Partnership. Links neighborhood schools with UIC in a variety of school improvement programs.

Community Health. Provides health resources for the community, including UIC's Mile Square Health Center, which sees 50,000 patients per year on the Near West Side.

UIC Neighborhoods and Non-Profits Network. Links 50 groups and organizations to the Internet through UIC's Academic Data Network.

• **Yale University.**[2] For the past two years, colleagues on Yale's campus and New Haven citizens have been working together to design a more ambitious set of Yale-New Haven initiatives. This effort recognizes the fact that even as the university has a financial endowment to preserve and enhance, so too does it have an environmental endowment—New Haven—that also entails significant stewardship responsibilities. The board of trustees views the futures of Yale and New Haven as inextricably linked and has identified New Haven as one of its greatest threats and/or opportunities.

Working with the city, Yale has identified three primary areas of attention: economic development, human development, and neighborhood revitalization. "Partnership" is the operative term in framing how Yale is working to advance each of these principal strategies. The university has long had a number of discrete projects pursued by faculty or schools with one or more of the key neighbors bordering its campus, but it has never developed a comprehensive approach to one neighborhood in concert with that neighborhood.

Yale University proposed to do just that with the Dwight-Edgewood-West River neighborhood by creating a Joint Community Development Program in collaboration with the city of New Haven and neighborhood leaders. In this program, the university will expand, enhance, and institutionalize its capacity to engage in successful community revitalization activities. In the process, it will help neighborhood residents and other partners achieve substantial and measurable revitalization of this community. The work will build on existing collaborations with New Haven, including the HUD-funded Neighborhood Partnerships Network, and current city efforts, including the Enterprise Community strategic plan.

The proposed Joint Community Development Program will build institutional capacity while meeting community needs. It will help the university realize its potential as an institutional citizen of New Haven in general and of this neighborhood in particular, as well as a source of broad and respected expertise in academic areas relevant to community development. The proposed program will not be constituted as a separate center, but instead will be central to all aspects of the university's activities and mission. In addition, the city's government and leading institutions, including several banks and a hospital, have demonstrated a commitment to this neighborhood, and are prepared for a concerted and collaborative effort. Thus, the program will face the challenges, difficulties, and frequent distress of an inner-city community by working with the neighborhood's diversity, tapping the stable institutions that border the community, and mobilizing for change with a committed group of local residents.

The extent of the university's commitment to this objective and to the strategies listed below is reflected in the breadth of proposed roles to be integrated into Yale's core structures, as well as in the provision of matching funds and in-kind contributions. Moreover, the potential for this effort's success is demonstrated by the depth of financial and other commitments made by the city, other institutions, and neighborhood groups. The program's community-outreach partnerships and strategies follow:

Building Partnerships. Creates governance mechanisms that make the university a true partner of neighborhood leaders and other institutional stakeholders, rather than a provider of technical assistance or sole director of programs.

Building Yale's Capacity. Creates administrative mechanisms for concentrated and coordinated community development. Deploys Yale's nonacademic resources to support neighborhood development. Expands and focuses Yale faculty and graduate and professional students on providing interdisciplinary consultation in the

neighborhood, training professionals for service locally and beyond, among other goals. Coordinates and focuses student volunteer efforts in neighborhoods.

Neighborhood Revitalization. Establishes mechanisms for collaborative financing, governance, implementation, and accountability. Increases employment opportunities through targeted and coordinated access to job training, recruitment and placement, and development of micro-enterprises and small businesses. Promotes homeownership and responsible behavior by landlords and tenants; creates or redesigns open spaces to support community development. Improves security and community policing capability by creating a partnership among city departments and between them and the neighborhood to support community development. Promotes optimal development of children and youth, in and out of school.

• **The University of Pennsylvania.**[3] The Center for Community Partnerships of the University of Pennsylvania is founded on the notion that the vast range of resources of the American university can, when appropriately and creatively employed, help a community determine how best to meet its needs. Over the past several years, the University of Pennsylvania and its neighboring communities have been working on the problem of how to create modern, cosmopolitan, local communities. The Center for Community Partnerships was started in 1992 to improve the internal coordination and collaboration of all universitywide community-service programs, create new and effective partnerships between the university and the community, encourage new and creative initiatives linking the university and the community, and strengthen a national network of institutions of higher education committed to engagement with their local communities. The center's director reports to the vice president for government, community, and public affairs and the provost.

Much of the center's work has focused on the public school as the educational and neighborhood institution that can, if effectively transformed, serve as the vehicle for tangible community change and innovation. Penn has tried to help create university-assisted community schools that function as the locus of education, services, engagement, and activity within specified geographic areas. Focusing on improving education and health in particular, Penn has helped develop significant service-learning programs. These engage young people in creative work designed to advance their skills and abilities as they provide services to their school, families, and community. Penn students and faculty also are engaged in service-learning projects that require the development and application of knowledge to solve problems. This Deweyan approach might be termed learning by reflective doing and active problem solving.

Another key initiative at Penn is the West Philadelphia Improvement Corps (WEPIC), which originated in the spring of 1985 from an honors history seminar co-taught by Penn's former president, Sheldon Hackney, and historians Lee Benson and Ira Harkavy. The research of four students on the issue of youth employment resulted in a proposal to create a youth corps that would use existing agencies and resources.

WEPIC has since grown into a year-round program that involves more than 3,000 children, their parents, and community members in education and cultural programs, recreation, job training, and community improvement and service activities. WEPIC is coordinated by the West Philadelphia Partnership—a mediating, not-for-profit community-based organization composed of institutions (including the University of Pennsylvania) and community groups in conjunction with the Greater Philadelphia Urban Affairs Coalition and the Philadelphia School District. Descriptions of Penn's community outreach partnerships and strategies follow.

Center for Community Partnerships. Currently engages in three types of initiatives: academically based community service, direct traditional service, and community and economic development.

West Philadelphia Improvement Corps. Produces comprehensive university-assisted community schools that serve, educate, involve, and activate all members of the community. Develops schools that are open to the public 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Works with unions; job-training agencies; churches; community groups; city, state, and federal agencies and departments; VISTA volunteers; local health institutions (including

Misericord Hospital, the Penn Medical Center, and Greater Philadelphia Health Action); and other community agencies and services.

• **The University of Louisville.**[4] The University of Louisville is involved in virtually all important educational, service, economic development, technology transfer, and cultural policy initiatives in the Louisville metropolitan area. From its inception, the university has been dedicated to providing programs related to the needs of the community. In the 1970s, the Kentucky Coordinating Council for Higher Education assigned the university an "urban mission" and designated it as Kentucky's urban university. President John W. Shumaker summarizes the university's position in the community:

> As a metropolitan research university, the University of Louisville must invest in making this community a better place for all its citizens. This community has become for us an extended classroom, an extended laboratory for bridging the gap between theory and practice. We cannot achieve our full promise as a metropolitan university unless and until Greater Louisville is able to realize its full potential. Our future as a university thus remains intertwined with the future of the people and institutions of Greater Louisville and the commonwealth.... We must have the courage to take responsible risks—and to learn from our failures as well as triumph in our successes. We assume this responsibility not in a prescriptive way—but as a partner. Our philosophy must be one of cooperation, collaboration, and responsiveness. It is a philosophy that our trustees accept and encourage; it is one of the reasons why the university of Louisville is a very exciting place to be (Shumaker 1995, p. 13).

A study conducted by the Office of Planning and Budget shows that university faculty (excluding dental and medical faculty) collectively spend more than 1,700 hours per week working on public and community service projects locally and regionally.

To increase student involvement in public and community service, some of the university's academic programs have incorporated student service requirements into the curricula. Medical residents and dental students are required to spend time training in the university's clinics. The School of Medicine's primary teaching facilities—the main source of medical treatment for the area's indigent patients—treat more than 160,000 patients annually. Similarly, the School of Law became, in 1990, one of only five schools in the country to adopt a public-service requirement. It obligates students to complete at least 30 hours of pro bono, law-related public service work at an approved placement. Sixty percent of these placements are located in the metropolitan area, contributing annually approximately 5,000 hours of public service work. The School of Nursing requires that students have field experience outside the classroom, such as in alternative community health care settings (housing projects and churches) designed to promote preventive health. The university's community outreach partnerships and strategies follow.

Housing and Neighborhood Development Strategies (HANDS). Develops effective and efficient programs to resolve housing and neighborhood problems (one of the first recipients of the U.S. Department of Education's Urban Community Service Grants). Offers homeownership counseling, job development, education, and leadership programs within a targeted low-income minority neighborhood, as well as community design services to students.

Kentucky Institute for the Environment and Sustainable Development. Addresses needs in education, management, policy issues, health studies, engineering, pollution prevention, and urban development, as well as research in the basic and social environmental sciences, through an interdisciplinary approach to the solution of environmental problems, especially those of the urban community. Works with industry and state and local government to develop programs focused on sustainable development through eight centers comprising the institute. Offers educational programs for school-age children and the public.

Rapid Prototyping Center. Uses a state-of-the-art system that develops prototype parts for university research and teaching programs and for a

consortium of manufacturers, small businesses, and governmental agencies. Allows consortium members to purchase development time on the equipment at a reduced rate and provides them access to ongoing research and development. Benefits students through direct application of leading-edge technology and introduces them to potential employers.

Southeast Regional Center for Drug Free School and Communities. Develops and disseminates programs preventing the use of alcohol and other drugs among youth in 12 areas of the Southeast as one of five regional centers in a national U.S. Department of Education-established network. Provides training, consultation, evaluation, and dissemination of available prevention information and technical support to interest groups, schools, and communities through a team approach. Helps state educational agencies coordinate and strengthen prevention strategies and helps local schools develop and implement preservice and in-service training programs for educational personnel.

Telecommunication Research Center. Developed jointly with South Central Bell, the Kentucky Cabinet for Economic Development, and the university a modern research facility and community resource to help businesses create new job markets and demonstrate the importance of the telecommunication infrastructure to society. Facilitates student and faculty work in telecommunications, such as the telemedicine and teledentistry programs that use university expertise to link rural teachers, parents, and the community.

End Notes

[1] The information on the University of Illinois at Chicago was provided by Wim Wiewel. More information is available from the Great Cities Office, University of Illinois at Chicago, 601 South Morgan Street (MC 102), Chicago, 60607-7128.

Pilsen, just south of the UIC campus, is home to a largely Mexican-American and Mexican immigrant community. The Near West Side is a largely African-American community with a high percentage of residents living in public housing developments.

[2] The Yale University information was provided by Linda Koch Lorimer, vice president and secretary, Office of New Haven Affairs, Yale University, 4333 Temple Street, New Haven, Conn. 06520-8332.

[3] The University of Pennsylvania information was provided by Dr. Ira Harkavy, Director, the Center for Community Partnerships, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104-3246.

[4] The information on the University of Louisville was provided by the author and Kim Lalley from the Center for Sustainable Neighborhoods, University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky. 40292.

Appendix B

Acknowledgments

About the Roundtable

The AGB roundtable was convened to (1) examine the policy issues underlying university-community partnerships aimed at improving the lives of inner-city residents; (2) look at appropriate roles for different players in the university in these partnerships, with a special focus on the role of the governing board; and (3) highlight existing partnership models.

The roundtable specifically focused on the partnerships that attempt to deal with the most difficult issues of urban life; this focus, however, did not discount the fact that many urban institutions are engaged in a variety of other worthwhile and necessary partnerships with their communities. This paper tries to present a balanced review of university-community partnerships by discussing successful cases and the barriers that can block success. In this way, some of the contradictory forces that facilitate or hamper university involvement in communities should become evident. Similarly, this approach should help convey the excitement—and the sense of frustration—of exploring new functions and opportunities for higher education. AGB hopes this paper stimulates the interest of urban college and university boards regarding the proper role of the urban institution.

Participants

John I. Gilderbloom, roundtable chair, chair of SUN (Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods), University at Louisville, and AGB consultant

Sarah Babson, program officer, U.S. Department of Education

Roger R. Blunt, former board chair, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges; and former vice chair, University of Maryland System

Nevin Brown, principal partner, American Association for Higher Education

Dolores E. Cross, president, Chicago State University

Michael J. Garanzini, S.J., vice president for academic affairs, St. Louis University

Joseph Harris, senior policy analyst, National Center for Urban Partnerships

Richard T. Ingram, president, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges

Judith James, former director of urban programs, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, and National Association and of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

Christine Johnson, director of urban initiatives, Education Commission of the States

Jane Karabil, senior program analyst, Office of University Partnerships, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Linda Koch Lorimer, vice president, office of New Haven affairs, Yale University

William Maxwell, former president, Jersey City State College

Clifford V. Smith, Jr., president, General Electric Foundation, and chancellor emeritus, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Michael A. Stegman, assistant secretary of research and policy development, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

William Stokes, president, Miami-Dade Community College, Kendall Campus

Wim Wiewel, special assistant to the chancellor, University of Illinois at Chicago

We also acknowledge the contributions of Russ Sims, Rachelle Seger, and Rob Mullins of the University of Louisville SUN programs, who conducted background research, and Dan Hall, Derek Bok, Raphael Nystrand, Patrick Flanagan, Marcia Marker Feld, Charles Ruch, and E. K. Fretwell, who made useful comments on draft versions of this paper.

AGB staff participating in the project included Richard D. Legon, executive vice president; Richard Novak, director of public sector programs;

and Carol Brubaker, assistant director of programs.

References

AASCU 1995. *AASCU and NASULGC Survey of Urban Universities.* Washington, D.C.

Bok, D. 1996. Personal correspondence to John I. Gilderbloom.

Boyer, E. L. 1992. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professorate.* Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Cisneros, Henry G. 1995. *The University and the Urban Challenge.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Diamond, R. M., and E. A. Bronwyn, eds. 1993. *Recognizing Faculty Work: Reward Systems for the Year 2000.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gamson, Z. 1995. "Faculty and Service." *Change 27* (1): 4.

Gilderbloom, John I. and Richard P. Appelbaum 1988. *Rethinking Rental Housing.* Philadelphia, Penn.: Temple University Press.

Groark, Christina J., and Robert B. McCall. In press. "Building Successful University-Community Human Service Agency Collaborations." In C. P. Fisher, J. P. Murray, and I. E. Siegel, eds., *Applied Developmental Science: Graduate Training for Diverse Disciplines and Educational Settings.* Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Johnson, D. M., and D. A. Bell, eds. 1995. *Metropolitan Universities: An Emerging Model in American Higher Education.* Denton, Texas: University of North Texas Press.

Jones, D. P. 1995. "Strategic Budgeting: The Board's Role in Public Colleges and Universities." *Occasional Paper No. 28.* Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Kerr, C. 1968. "The Urban-Grant University: A Model for the Future." *The City College Papers* 8. New York: The City College of New York.

Klotsche, J. M. 1966. *The Urban University and the Future of Our Cities.* New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Ruch, C. P., and E. P. Trani. 1995. "Scope and limitations of community interactions." In D. M. Johnson and D. A. Bell, eds., *Metropolitan Universities: An Emerging Model in American Higher Education,* pp. 231-43. Denton, Texas: University of North Texas Press.

Shumaker, J. W. (1995). "Continuity, Change, and Community." Speech given September 28. Louisville, Ky.: University of Louisville.

Stukel, J. J. (1994). "The Urban University Attacks Real Urban Issues." *Government Finance Review* 21: 19-21.

About the Author

John I. Gilderbloom is professor of economics and urban policy at the University of Louisville, where he directs three research centers: SUN (Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods), HANDS (Housing and Neighborhood Development Strategies), and the Urban Center on Aging. Over the past four years, Gilderbloom has been awarded $3 million from the U.S. Department of Education's Urban Community Service program and has published numerous articles on the role of the university in the community. He is the author of three books, 20 refereed scholarly articles, ten book chapters, and opinion pieces in the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Washington Post*, the *Los Angeles Times*, and *USA Today*. His scholarly research has earned him numerous awards; he has consulted with U.S. HUD on numerous occasions, and President Clinton has praised his university-community partnership programs.

The AGB Occasional Paper Series

1. **Emerging Policy Issues for Community Colleges**, by Louis W. Bender
2. **Emerging Policy Issues for State Coordinating Boards**, by Patrick M. Callan
3. **Emerging Policy Issues for Public Multicampus Systems**, by Aims C. McGuinness, Jr.
4. **Emerging Policy Issues for Foundations of Public Institutions**, by Royster C. Hedgepeth
5. **Emerging Policy Issues for Single-Campus Public Institutions**, by Kenneth P. Mortimer
6. **Emerging Policy Issues for Historically Black Institutions**, by Alan H. Kirschner
7. **Emerging Policy Issues for Theological Schools and Seminaries**, by Christa R. Klein
8. **Emerging Policy Issues for Church-Related Institutions**, by Reverend William McInnes
9. **Emerging Policy Issues for Private Research Universities**, by Roger L. Geiger
10. **Emerging Policy Issues for Liberal Arts Colleges**, by Kathryn Mohrman
11. **Information Systems for Boards of Theological Seminaries**, by Lawrence M. Butler
12. **Achieving Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics**, by Wilford S. Bailey
13. **Policies for Improving Trustee Selection in the Public Sector**, by Patrick M. Callan and Dean A. Honetschlager
14. **Emerging Issues in Independent School (K-12) Governance**, by Pearl R. Kane
15. **Tuition and Finance Issues for Public Institutions**, by Thomas P. Wallace, Darryl J. Greer, and James R. Mingle
16. **Issues of Athletic Certification for NCAA Division I Members**, by Maureen E. Devlin
17. **Long-Term Tuition Policy: What Happens When Tuition Rises Faster Than Ability to Pay?**, by John A. Dunn, Jr.
18. **"New Partnering" for Higher Education and the Corporate Sector**, by Delwin A. Roy
19. **Board Effectiveness in Theological Schools**, by Barbara E. Taylor and Christa R. Klein
20. **A Prescription for Vitality for Small, Private Colleges**, by Ruth B. Cowan
21. **Strategic and Operational Reform in Public Higher Education: A Mandate for Change**, by Robert C. Shirley
22. **Higher Education: On a Collision Course With New Realities**, by David W. Breneman
23. **Results of a National Survey of Theological School Board Characteristics, Policies, and Practices**, by Merrill P. Schwartz
24. **Integrating Endowment and Budget Planning**, by Myron P. Curzan and Louis H. Katz
25. **The "Local Board" in Multicampus Systems and Universities**, by Edgar B. Schick
26. **The New Activism of Corporate Boards and the Implications for Campus Governance**, by Richard P. Chait
27. **Reducing Student Costs and Enhancing Student Learning**, by Alan E. Guskin
28. **Strategic Budgeting: The Board's Role in Public Colleges and Universities**, by Dennis P. Jones
29. **Not So Different After All: Academic and Industrial Leadership in the 1990s**, by Henry E. Riggs
30. **The Urban University in the Community: The Roles of Boards and Presidents**, by John I. Gilderbloom

Individuals affiliated with AGB-member institutions may photocopy and distribute copies of this paper. If you would like additional copies bound in this format, please use this order form or call AGB Publications at 202/296-8400.

Each copy costs $4.95 ($3.95 each for 10 or more). For orders more than $10 but less than $29, please add $3 for shipping and handling. For orders $30-$49, please add $5. For orders $50-$100, add $7. For orders less than $10 or larger than $100, we ship for free.

Paper number in series	How many copies?	Cost
	Shipping	
	Total	

Name _____

Address _____

_____

City, State, Zip _____

Phone _____

Mail to AGB Publications, One Dupont Circle, Suite 400, Washington, D.C. 20036. Questions? Call 202/296-8400.

ORDERS FOR LESS THAN $25 MUST BE PREPAID. If your order totals $25 or more, we can bill you. Simply mail this form to AGB or fax it to 202-223-7053.